DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 548 HE 010 544

AUTHOR Adams, Algalee; Greenwald, Herbert
TITLE A Faculty Moves Toward Renewal. A Summary Report. The Second Year of Project Renewal, 1975-76, a Faculty-Oriented and Faculty-Guided Project to Improve the Quality of Education in the State Colleges.
INSTITUTION Massachusetts State Coll. System, Boston.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [77]
GRANT OEG-0-74-8710
NOTE 17p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Curriculum Development; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Instructional Improvement; Interprofessional Relationship; Multicampus Colleges; Program Budgeting; Program Evaluation; *State Colleges; State Programs; *Teacher Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Massachusetts; *Project Renewal

ABSTRACT

This summary report about Project Renewal provides an overview of the need for faculty development and the concept of a representative faculty collaborative. The purpose of the project was to prepare the State College System for the establishment of a Center for Educational Development, a conceptual center, rather than a geographical center. Nineteen faculty workshops that were conducted are described. In order to provide incentives for faculty to pursue the issues raised in the workshops and to further test out the assumption that System-sponsored training sessions could have direct feedback on the campuses, Project Renewal sponsored a competition for proposals relating to curriculum development. Eight projects involving 23 faculty from seven colleges were funded. The products of these projects are available for use by any of the colleges. A directory of human and physical resources in the State College System was also compiled. All but one of the 19 workshops were formally evaluated by participants at the end of each workshop. The program of faculty workshops was further subjected to an extensive summative evaluation that related faculty responses to a wide range of issues. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED162548

A FACULTY MOVES TOWARD RENEWAL

Massachusetts State College System

A SUMMARY REPORT

The Second Year of PROJECT RENEWAL, 1975-76,
a Faculty-oriented and Faculty-guided Project
to Improve the Quality of Education in the State Colleges

Submitted To

Mr. David Justice
Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Room 3141
Washington, D.C. 20202

Submitted By
James J. Hammond
Chancellor

William P. Haas
Associate Director, Academic Affairs
Director, Project Renewal

Algalee Adams, Associate Director
Herbert Greenwald, Assistant Director

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 010 544

INTRODUCTION

The final report of Project Renewal is like a section of the log of an unfinished odyssey. We have moved toward a point of destiny and there is no turning back, but the end has not been fully accomplished. Perhaps the end or purpose of revitalizing a vast educational enterprise is never simply achieved. But it is of great value to learn how it is possible to advance upon that goal and to learn of the disasterous consequences of indifference or inattention.

This Summary Report, for want of a better name, is actually a digest and interpretation of the rather lengthy history of the Project written by Dr. Algalee Adams, Associate Director of Project Renewal, and Dr. Herbert Greenwald, Assistant Director. After the Project was completed, and they had returned to their full-time faculty responsibilities, they continued to gather all the data, materials and communications that came out of the Project and to write a comprehensive study of the endeavor. That document will be available to all interested parties. It goes into much greater detail than this Summary Report does, providing an overview of the need for faculty development and the concept of a representative faculty Collaborative. It examines in depth the program's conceptual framework, its operation, accomplishments, details of evaluation procedures and results and recommendations for future options. It also includes a review of the literature which influenced the formation of the Project and examines the economic and demographic factors which are expected to determine the future of higher education in Massachusetts.

THE TRANSITION

At the end of June, 1975, Project Renewal and with it the State College System had reached a plateau. For the first time an organized team of faculty, working constructively with members of the Central Administration, had come to some practical conclusions about the future of undergraduate education in Massachusetts and their role in it. In view of all the forces militating against it, it was worth the investment from the State System and from FIPSE to bring about a recognition of the need for structure, leadership, focus and learning in the area of three dimensional faculty development. Seen in this way, faculty development is inseparable from instructional or curricular development and organizational development. The forces militating against such advancement had to be faced in an open forum, with the realization that faculty had as much at stake through inaction as they had through initiative. They learned through the meetings of the Collaborative to analyze those impediments to change and to deal with them. The isolation of individuals, of departments and of institutions was partially resolved through frequent and sustained dialogue. The temptation to hang on to the sure thing was met with an opportunity to meet with people who had done the "impossible." The limitations of resources and the paucity of incentives were balanced by

the generous commitment of the State System and of FIPSE, and the level of recognition that this brought to the task.

But the first year ended with a sense that the task was perhaps overwhelmingly large and complex. This sense of impotence and frustration was overcome in part in an agreement to try to do the doable. Sharpen the focus, tackle the job at the level of basic principles and learn to do the possible.

FACULTY WORKSHOPS

Thus the forward momentum was regained with the plan to use the second year's funding to launch a series of training sessions for all faculty in the System who were interested in focused change. The focus was upon the what and how of introductory undergraduate teaching and learning. The question was asked: What can we do to make the experience of the freshman class, 1976, different and perhaps better than that of their predecessors? The learning or training sessions were designed as one or two day workshops of the traditional kind, but they were pre-planned to expose faculty to new ideas and new ways of dealing with them. Every workshop had its explicity practical aspects, since it was expected that faculty would return to their campuses motivated to try some new things themselves and to disseminate the good news.

Throughout the process, contact with Collaborative members was maintained since they were to be the guiding forces and facilitators on campus. For each system-wide workshop there was to be a campus workshop or seminar preceding or following it, dealing with an aspect of the topic. This did not work perfectly, of course, but as the workshops became more well known and evaluation was fed back into improvements in delivery and subject matter, the impact on campuses improved. A final evaluation, of which there will be more later, showed more exactly what worked or failed and why.

The conductors of the workshops were drawn from all over the country and from a wide range of institutional settings and backgrounds. Many of them came to our attention through reports and contacts under FIPSE auspices. All of them made special efforts on our behalf because they saw our undertaking as uniquely significant. Generally, almost universally, their informal observations on broad aspects of educational development beyond the specific topic helped the staff and collaborative to expand their vision of what was going on nationally.

Nineteen workshops were eventually mounted, three in the first semester, sixteen in the second. A good part of the work for the first semester concentrated onorganizing the more intensive program to follow.

The first workshop addressed the topic of grantsmanship. Directed by Laurence Hall of the University of Chicago and Loretta Butler of Fordham University, it was intended to demonstrate to faculty that the lack of direct and sufficient support for innovation from State appropriations need not be an insurmountable obstacle to change. With the assistance of Grace Ward of HEW's Boston Office, the workshops culminated with exercizes in grant proposal writing. Since this was the first workshop, it was particularly encouraging when the representatives of Salem State College who attended, set up their own workshop on campus, attended by 45 faculty, and subsequently formed a group to assist other faculty throughout the year.

The other first semester workshop dealt with interdisciplinary studies. It was organized by collaborative members from four of the colleges and attended from throughout the System. The keynote speaker and principal resource person was Robert von der Luppe of Hampshire College.

The second semester's workshops addressed topics affecting the teaching/learning process, especially as it applies to the acquisition or cultivation of basic skills. Videotapes were made of each of the sixteen sessions, which have been edited for distribution in the System. There is also a written description of the material presented.

The workshops took place at different campuses and were scheduled so as to move from the issue of basic skills, through ways of assessing individual learning styles and then to explore several strategies for teaching. A brief description of each of the workshops follows.

Basic Thinking Skills, presented by Lyle M. Ehrenberg, Director, Institute for Staff Development, Miami, Florida, February 23, 1976, was held at Bridgewater State College and explored the BASICS approach, that is "Building and Applying Strategies for Intellectual Competencies in Students."

Grants: Proposal Development Workshop I, presented by Julia M. Jacobsen, College Consortium, Washington, D.C. February 24, 1976, at Worcester State College, was the first of a two part series which demonstrated techniques in proposal writing and evaluation. Participants role-played a review panel and developed guidelines for use in the subsequent session. Proposals were to deal with basic skills needs.

Instructional Video Tapes: Basic Skills, presented by Marti Shaplen of Time-Life Films, Inc. and Hampton Huff, University of Connecticut, on March 4, 1976, at Westfield State College, discussed the educational design and content of the Time-Life course in reading. It also examined a video tape course in communicating skills and a course in negotiating skills. Special attention was given to the design and operation of a learning skills center.

Grants: Proposal Development Workshop II, continued by Julia Jacobsen on March 10, at Worcester State, critiqued the proposals prepared since the first session, with a view to content and form. The rationale of these two sessions, while addressing the need for resources, addressed with equal vigor the need to be able to articulate and defend the theoretical and practical aspects of innovative projects.

Competency Based Education, presented by Rachel Brake, certified trainer in Criterion Referenced Education, State of Michigan, on March 18, 19, at the Massachusetts Maritime Academy, trained the participants in writing departmental, personal and instructional objectives and in methods for testing and evaluating student progress.

Successful Interdisciplinary Teaching, presented by Harry Broudy, University of Illinois, Maxine Green, Columbia University, Carol Holden, University of Illinois and Stanley Madeja of Cremel, Inc. on March 22, 23, at Boston State College, concentrated on interdisciplinary approaches to aesthetic education, with its implications for other areas of learning. This was especially emphasized by Professor Broudy at a special lecture and discussion attended by the Chancellor, a member of the Board of Trustees, a College President and other administrators and faculty.

Individualizing Instruction, presented by Nancy Soper, Curriculum Specialist State of Michigan, on March 31 and April 1, at Salem State College, provided training in individualized instruction, including the diagnosis of students centered goals, testing, instructional styles and human development.

Alternative Pathways to Student Learning, presented by Joseph Hill, Oakland Community College, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, on April 5, at Bridgewater State College, stressed the need for matching instructional styles with student preferred learning styles. It showed how this approach can be effectively applied to the diagnosis and correction of writing difficulties.

Visual Thinking, presented by Donis Dondis of Boston University, on April 7 at Bridgewater State College, probed various aspects of visual literacy, analyzing the structure of visual data and imaginative use of visual aids in teaching. The pedagogical implications of the different functions of the left and right sides of the brain (logic and intuitive imagery) were explored.

Customized Learning, presented by a team from Fitchburg State College, Francis Pelicki, William Powers and David Ryder, on April 13, offered training in Joseph Hill's cognitive mapping strategy. The session emphasized a team teaching approach to individualized or customized learning.

Visual Learning, presented by Donald L. Brigham, Director of Visual Arts Center, Attleboro, Massachusetts, on April 21, at Salem State College, used films and slides to demonstrate approaches to individuals who learn visually rather than through other modalities. Participants developed visual test games to identify preferential visual learners and translated sample college lessons into new visual forms.

The International Dimensions of Higher Education, presented by Paul Leubke, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C., Paul Parks, Secretary for Education and Cultural Affairs, Commonwealth of Massachusetts and Leonard Savignano, Center for International Education, State College System, on April 28 at the Maritime Academy, stressed the need for students to be aware of international affairs as part of their basic education. The session explored the opportunities for intercultural contacts through cooperative programs.

Films that Motivate, presented by Charles Goldstone of Worcester State College, on May 5 at Worcester, showed portions of fourteen films which were particularly effective in motivating students to learn in a wide variety of areas.

Competency Based Education for System Leaders, presented by Robert Roth, Michigan Department of Education, and Mary Austin Doherty, Alverno College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, on May 6 at the Central Office, Boston, described curricular and administrative aspects of competency based education. It probed the difficulties in dealing with faculty attitudes and departmental structures and stressed the need for careful planning and thorough training for faculty.

Educational Technology, led by David Ryder, Fitchburg State College, began with a discussion of the value of educational technology by Chancellor Hammond, followed by small group discussions of the need for the System to better utilize its potential in this area.

Student Counseling, presented by Ira Progoff, Dialogue House, New York City, on May 24, at Boston State College, examined the possibility of applying his special technique of improving self awareness to the learning needs of students. Particular attention was given to the problems of urban colleges such as Boston State which serve a large population of students who suffer cultural, economic and educational disadvantages.

The Role of the Department Chairperson, presented by David Lewit, Massachusetts Psychological Center, Boston, June 10 and 14, at North Adams State College, attempted to clarify and improve the leadership effectivensss, role definition, self confidence, departmental objectives, planning and initiative for change in traditional academic departments. Representatives from departments particularly concerned with basic learning needs attended.

SUMMER PROJECTS

In order to provide incentives for faculty to pursue the issues raised in the workshops and to further test out the assumption that System sponsored training sessions could have direct feed back on the campuses, Project Renewal sponsored a competition for proposals relating to curriculum development. Ultimately eight projects i nvolving twenty three faculty from seven of the colleges were selected and funded. They were:

Library/Media Resources and Beyond, designed to help information seekers better utilize resources, Salem State.

Individualized Treatment of Problems in Basic Writing Skills, Fitchburg State.

An Individualized Self-paced Program in Composition, Bridgewater State.

Individualized Modules to Teach Basic Skills in Composition and Rhetoric, Boston State.

Music Appreciation Syllabus Competency-Performance Based, Boston State

A Supportive System for Core Mathematics Courses, Westfield State.

A Handbook of Teaching Competencies Expected of Student Teachers at the Completion of Their Professional Field Experience, Boston, Westfield, Salem and Framingham State.

The products of these projects, workbooks, course plans, audio and visual materials are available at the Central Office of the System for use by any of the Colleges, and plans are under consideration to asure wide dissemination. The first step toward this was taken at the November meeting of the Trustee Committee on Academic Affairs when a report on the Summer projects was made before a group of trustees, faculty, students and administrators.

One of the most useful products coming out of Project Renewal has been the compilation of material for a directory of human and physical resources in the State College System. Tentatively named "The Yellow Pages," the directory concentrates upon those persons, activities, materials and facilities which advance innovation. The responses of individuals and of institutions to the opportunity has been very strong and has revealed many unsuspected resources which can be directed to system-wide use. The data had been programed for computer so as to allow for long range updating.

EVALUATION

The first year of Project Renewal's activities was subject to five formal evaluations and several informat reviews of progress. These later took place through interviews with individual administrators and faculty and through periodic reports to the Trustee Committee on Academic Affairs which, as public sessions, elicited the comments and recommendations of many constituencies. The formal evaluations, however, were more structured and three of them were part of the planned process of self-correction. Thus the three formative evaluations of Kemp, Lavin and Bush looked at the process of team building and the search for an articulation of problems and solutions. The summative evaluations by Genova and Khlief pinpointed the accomplishments and failures as well as the areas requiring further action. As a result of these evaluations, it was clear that the undertaking needed sharper focus on a small range of issues, with a precise program of activities and with more explicit involvement of administrators and students. It was generally agreed that the foundation for a Center for Educational Development was taking shape and that it would be necessary to demonstrate to the key decision makers that certain faculty development activities could succeed.

The second year's evaluations took an appropriately different form, once the course of action had been determined. Since the workshops and their correlative efforts were directed toward faculty training in the principles and practices of innovative approaches to basic learning needs, the evaluation tested the responses and the needs of this clientele.

There continued to be the ongoing unstructured evaluations at meetings with participants, administrators, union leaders and Trustees. Among such meetings were two more intensive reviews with Collaborative members, one three day meeting at Rockport and another all day meeting at Shrewsbury, both toward the end of the second year and directed toward the full scope of Project Renewal activities. There had been during the year many personal contacts with Collaborative members to assist in their campus efforts

and to gather feedback from workshop participants. All of these unstructured evaluations agreed basically with the pattern of response that emerged from the structured evaluations, namely that follow-through was necessary, that communications were still imperfect and needed attention, that more people were becoming aware of the advantages of system-wide cooperation in the area of educational development.

The second year of Project Renewal was, of course, subjected to more structured evaluations, some formative, others reviewing the total program at its completion.

Dr. Herbert Greenwald, Assistant Director of Project Renewal and Professor of Psychology at Bridgewater State College, was responsible for the evaluation of the second year of the Project and has documented the process of evaluation through the two years. He has also developed the instruments of evaluation for the second year. What follows is a summary and interpretation of his findings.

All but the first and the last of the nineteen workshops were formally evaluated by participants at the end of each workshop. Participants were asked to respond to fixed alternative questions: a five point rating scale and also several open-ended questions. The experience with the first few workshops led to the development of a questionnaire that could be applied to the remaining sessions.

The questionnaire sought five types of information: a numerical evaluation of each workshop's effectiveness, the strengths and weaknesses of each session, how participants intended to utilize the information and training, and recommendations for the improvement of future workshops. The broad pattern that emerged looked something like this. The most favorably received workshops were those which occured at the end of the semester, indicating that it took time to build a level of interest and acceptance. Faculty rated highly those workshops which presented new and useful insights. The evaluation also showed that faculty respected the degree of preparation and expertise that went into the programs, indicating significantly that faculty were open to learning from "outsiders".

The program of faculty workshops was further subjected to an extensive summative evaluation which related faculty responses to a wide range of issues in addition to the workshops themselves. This formal evaluation was distributed to three populations: 1) a random sample of State College faculty, 2) the faculty who attended the workshops and 3) the members of the Collaborative. Since these different groups had varying degrees of familiarity with Project Renewal itself and with the specific workshop sessions, the evaluation allowed for significant comparisons and inferences.

The questionnaire contained over forty items, revealing attitudes toward faculty development, student learning needs, the implications of System-wide cooperation, Project Renewal itself and the future of such offerings.

In the words of Dr. Greenwald, the results looked like this: "The results from the random sample indicated that faculty members who were receptive to faculty development subscribed to four especially salient aspects: helping improve teaching, participation in faculty development activities other than those of Project Renewal's, concern that the college provide students with basic skills training, and a belief that good teachers are born rather than developed.

Among the workshop participants those prone to development activities were interested in bringing people together from different colleges, were working with members of the Campus Collaborative Team, were concerned about improving the basic skills of students, wanted to attend to the attitudinal and emotional aspects of student 's education, and felt that student evaluations of faculty effectiveness were worthwhile.

When the results of these two samples were combined, a profile was obtained of faculty members who were interested in self-development compared to those who were not. This profile is as follows:

I. Interest in the whole student. These faculty members seem to be concerned with many aspects of students' development, not just the development of the students' abilities in a single discipline. This interest includes the affective side of students' lives and students' basic skills.

II. Deep involvement in improving teaching. These faculty members feel that they are naturally good teachers and are also continually honing these inherent abilities. They do this by such things as participating in many faculty development activities and actively revising their teaching, utilizing student feedback. This is analogous to the naturally talented musicians who are working to enhance their skills.

III. Collaboration with others. These faculty members enjoy learning from others and are engaged in cooperative activities with other people. They enjoy meeting with faculty from other campuses and working with the faculty development team at their campus."

It is Dr. Greenwald's conclusion that "The results of this discriminate analysis are consistent with the conceptual framework upon which Project Renewal was established." In other words, there does indeed exist within the state colleges a significant number of faculty interested in and disposed to a system-wide program of faculty development provided that it

deals with the real issues of education and is of high quality and relevance. Dr. Greenwald's sample indicates that roughly one half of the State College faculty were aware of the Project and were likely to participate in future efforts of this kind.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of Project Renewal was to prepare the State College System for the establishment of a Center for Educational Development, a conceptual center, rather than a geographical center. As the result of the organization, planning, learning and experimentation which was made possible by the grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, the State College System is more of a cohesive unit, with more individuals alerted to the possibilities of change and its genuine benefits. Furthermore, they know how to do many things that heretofore were vague and seemingly remote "impossibilities."

The System now has valuable materials, printed, visual and audial, which are being shared and which allow for further dissemination. It has acquired experiences which are now being focused within individual colleges and the System. It has identified and encouraged forward looking faculty to take an active part in the process of change. Students are beginning to see the benefits of learning along with a learning and self renewing faculty.

In order to take advantage of these benefits, the Chancellor of the State College System has reallocated the responsibilities of the Associate Director for Academic Affairs so that he can spend most of his time directing a System-wide endeavor to develop new and effective general education options. The generic mission of the State Colleges is very much determined by the way in which they relate the fundamental values of general education to their more specialized educational programs, both academic and career. Thus the progress and momentum of Project Renewal provides an important underpinning for this effort to deal with a System-wide concern in a systematic way.

A formally structured Center for Educational Development does not yet exist, and the reasons for this are multiple. Financial restrictions are of course obvious, given the economy of the nation, of the New England region and of the State. The administrative reasons, though less obvious, are no less compelling. It was essential that, in the recent reorganization of the structure of the State College System, the role of the Central Administration would be redefined. In the area of academic affairs, the redefinition has been away from regulatory and procedural functions and toward developmental functions. In effect, the Central staff is now in a better position than ever before to concentrate its efforts in working with College administrators and faculty in an

organized effort to evaluate existing general education offerings, to develop strategies to deal with the professional needs of faculty, the learning needs of students and the organizational relationships which affect the delivery of educational services in this area. Hence, the three dimensional development approach evolved by Project Renewal remains as a guiding principle in the revitalization of general education.

This effort has taken the following form. Two formal papers on general and liberal education were prepared for presentation to the Council of Presidents, representing each of the State Colleges. One paper explored six different approaches to general and liberal education; the other, attempted to analyze the problems with general education in the State Colleges and to recommend a series of initial steps to bring the problem to the surface for institutional debate.

In order to build upon this initial discussion, each president and dean was approached with a view to learning more about the single institution's difficulties and efforts. From these conversations it became clear that there were difficulties, but that several forces militated against any attempt to reform the entire general education program at any one school. The strategy of working for some alternative options for small populations of students and on an experimental basis then appeared as the reasonable way to instigate some movement toward change. The presidents and deans were encouraged to identify teams of faculty who would be willing to explore such options. At four of the College such groups are formed or close to taking shape.

Since the Association for General and Liberal Education met in Boston in October, 1976, the occasion was used to bring together some deans and faculty so that they might be able to see the issue in its national context and to begin to uncover alternative approaches underway outside the System.

In November and December 1976 meetings of the Trustee Committee on Academic Affairs met at two of the colleges, with representatives of college faculty and administrators, to bring the discussion of general education into an open form, independent of the narrowing focus of local concerns. Here, both policy implications and practical implementation issues surfaced. A long hoped for possibility emerged when some faculty present urged that a two or three day workshop be conducted by the Associate Director on general education, with particular emphasis on faculty needs to understand the issue in depth and to examine alternatives. This break through provides the opportunity to engage the network of change agents developed through Project Renewal. It also

provides the opening for introducing the faculty to the materials developed through the previous workshops and summer projects sponsored by Project Renewal.

Most recently, a third paper on general education was prepared for the public meeting of the full Board of Trustees in December, 1976,which summarized the previous work and recommended several specific actions designed to begin an ongoing revitalization of general education. That paper is being circulated throughout the System and should provide a foundation for both campus based and System-wide debate about the next steps to be taken.

The collection of written materials, audio visual materials and existing models is being disseminated also so that some independent examination can take place on each campus.

Concurrent with these centralized efforts to make the entire System aware of the need for review of general education, one particular effort deserves special mention because of its local and its state wide implications. The Central Office has been working very closely with the Hoosuck Community Resources Corporation, a recipient of a FIPSE grant, and North Adams State College to create a unique general and liberal education option which relates academic disciplines to "guild education". Under the tentative theme Homo Faber, Homo Sapiens (Man the Maker, Man the Knower), an attempt will be made to design a curriculum which fosters intellectual growth in the arts, humanities and sciences along with growth in manual and design skill and aesthetic perception. The assumption is made that the crafts are central to the history of civilization and an illuminating point of focus for the sciences. The success of this effort will depend upon the working cooperation between academic faculty and master craftsmen. Such a team is being formed, and will work closely with Central Office assistance.

A centralized program of educational development is underway. Not a single experience gained through Project Renewal has been lost. In fact every day opportunities to apply its benefits present themselves. In a time of diminished resources, personnel and finances, it is necessary to exploit every advantage available. And Project Renewal has provided one such rich reserve of experience and material proving most useful to the educational revitalization of the State Colleges.

BUDGET

SYSTEM-WIDE RENEWAL PROJECT
SECOND-YEAR BUDGET REPORT

	PROVIDED by F.I.P.S.E.	PROVIDED by M.S.C.S.
A. Direct Costs		
1. Salaries		
a. Professional		
Project Director		13,459.04
Associate Project Director	30,310.70	4,575.20
Assistant Project Director	27,131.60	3,422.40
M.S.C.S. Project		22,705.76
SUB-TOTAL	57,442.30	44,162.40
b. Consultants		
In-System	12,201.22	36,262.80
Non-System	8,827.44	573.56
SUB-TOTAL	21,028.66	36,836.36
c. Secretarial	17,855.25	11,490.67
SUB-TOTAL	17,855.25	11,490.67
2. Fringe Benefits	1,000.00	-0-
SUB-TOTAL	1,000.00	-0-
3. Travel		
Consultant	2,869.20	170.25
College Personnel	3,803.72	21.18
Project Staff	2,235.09	661.83
SUB-TOTAL	8,908.01	853.26
4. Materials and Supplies	2,586.50	-0-
SUB-TOTAL	2,586.50	-0-
5. Audio-Visual	3,698.00	-0-
SUB-TOTAL	3,698.00	-0-

SECOND-YEAR BUDGET REPORT
(CONTINUED)

		PROVIDED by F.I.P.S.E.	PROVIDED by M.S.C.S.
6. Office Rental		4,200.00	-0-
	SUB-TOTAL	4,200.00	-0-
B. Indirect Costs		12,881.00	46,671.35
	SUB-TOTAL	12,881.00	46,671.35
	TOTAL DIRECT COSTS	116,718.72	93,342.69
	TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS	12,881.00	46,671.35
	TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	129,599.72	140,014.04
First-Year Expenditures		111,623.28	147,702.37
Second-Year Expenditures		129,599.72	140,014.04
Total Expenditures		241,223.00	287,716.41

Total Cash Receipts from F.I.P.S.E. $241,223.00